

### **Remarks**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the foregoing amendments prior to re-examination of the above-identified patent application.

Claims 33-34 and 37-61 are pending. Claims 33, 42, 43 and 46 are amended, claims 35 and 36 are canceled, and claims 60 and 61 are added by way of this Amendment. The amendments to claim 33, and newly-added claims 60 and 61, are supported by the original specification and the original claims. In particular, the features of the gaming chip testing area added to claim 33 appear *inter alia* at paragraph [0017] of the specification, and the description of the gaming table layout features is readily observed by perusal of Figure 1. The features permitting the anti-collision function are fully described in the specification paragraph [0041]. Claims 33, 42, 43 and 46 have been further amended for editorial purposes. Therefore, no new matter has been added by way of this Amendment, and entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 33, 38, 39, 44, 51, 52 and 56 as allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Gelinotte, US Patent Publication No. 2004/0229682 ("Gelinotte"). Further, the Office Action opines that claims 34, 35, 40 and 53 were obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gelinotte. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As set forth in paragraphs [0005] through [0013] of the instant specification, and in distinction over the prior art, the claimed gaming table and its method of use by virtue of combining the testing area, display device and chip storage area in reach and in view of the operator, permits the operator to manipulate the chips—in stacks—without diverting his attention from where it needs to be—on the table, the game and the players. In particular,

thanks to the anti-collision feature, the operator, with a single sweep of his hand, can now electronically check the value and authenticity of stacked chips before placing them in the chip storage area, with his attention fully maintained across the table. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 33 to recite these limitations

Turning now to Gelinotte, the limited disclosure therein is aptly defined by its title, abstract, and claims—it is merely drawn to a chip storing station for reading and/or writing in gaming chips. In one embodiment, (Col. 1, para. [0003]; also Col. 11, para. [0092]), Gelinotte prophetically suggests that his chip storing station can be incorporated into a “gaming table,” and that there also may be a display peripheral (paragraph [0061]) communicating with the Gelinotte processor “in the conventional way” which is not specified.

Applicant points out that that Gelinotte simply does not teach the claimed features of “at least one test station” and “at least one display device.” Moreover, the gaming table of the instant claims requires that the gaming chip be located in the test station, not the storage rack, when information is exchanged between the test area and the gaming chip. This is clear contradistinction to the system of Gelinotte, wherein *the information exchange only occurs when the chip is positioned in the storage system*. See Gelinotte, Col. 2, paragraph [0016].

Similarly, while the disclosure of Gelinotte at Col. 7, paragraph [0061] discloses “display peripheral,” it does not teach the instant claimed display device. The claims recite, “said display device displays on said screen the total value of the batch of chips placed in said gaming chip testing area which permits a rapid authentication of the said gaming chips by comparison of the total value displayed with the value mentally

calculated by the operator.” The prior art disclosure of Gelinotte is not sufficient to teach the claimed display device.

The claims of the instant application specifically call for a much more comprehensively recited gaming table with specifically placed, oriented, and interrelated components—whose orientation and location are not disclosed by Gelinotte. Gelinotte simply does not put one of ordinary skill in possession of all the features of the instant invention, much less *as claimed*. For a proper holding of anticipation, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claims. It follows that Gelinotte cannot be properly said to anticipate the instant claims. See MPEP §2131. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action also rejects claims 34, 35, 40, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelinotte. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding claim 34, the Office Action asserts that, “Gelinotte discloses all the elements of this claim except that the display screens are flush mounted with the table top. However, it is well-known in the art to mount the display screens flat with respect to the tabletop of the play surface.” As discussed above regarding the 35 USC §102 rejection of independent claim 33, Gelinotte does not anticipate, *inter alia*, the claimed display device. Additionally, nowhere does Gelinotte’s disclosure teach that, “the display device is a flat screen.” Furthermore, while the Examiner contends that this limitation is well-known, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a reference to teach such limitation. In the absence of such, this rejection is improper.

Regarding claim 35, because claim 35 is dependent from claim 33 which is allowable, this claim rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 40 and 53, because these claims also require “the testing area” and are dependent from claims 33 and 51, respectively, this rejection also should be withdrawn. Similarly, as noted above with respect to claim 34, the Office Action simply asserts that the limitations in claims 40 and 53 are well-known. Again, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a reference to teach these limitations; otherwise it is improper to continue rejecting these claims.

Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner further rejects claims 36, 37, 41, 42, 45-50, 54, 55 and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelinotte and further in view of French (U.S. Patent No. 5,735,742, “French”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding claim 36, the Examiner admits that Gelinotte does not teach the testing area and display screen being on opposite sides of the storage area and that French teaches these limitations (referring to Figure 3 of French). The Office Action indicated that a motivation for such is to yield a logical table design that is attractive to a player thereby increasing the appeal of the game. However, Figure 3 of French does not depict anything pertaining to a testing area. French discloses that “upon receiving, testing for reliability, and accepting each chip shipment, each casino will have the added capability of imbedding the casino’s own security code, which may be later updated or nullified by that casino” (Col. 8, lines 9-13). This passage teaches that French’s casino does not have a chip testing station because each casino owner tests

chips for reliability upon receiving them. Furthermore, Applicant notes that French does not teach the limitation and the motivation as alleged by the Examiner. It appears that the alleged motivation is based upon hindsight in that French nowhere discloses or suggests this motivation. Because Gelinotte and French do not disclose a testing area, claim 36 is not obvious over Gelinotte in view of French.

Regarding independent claim 46, the Office Action asserts that Gelinotte and French disclose a chip testing area (station) and a display device. However, as discussed above, Gelinotte and French do not teach the limitation of "at least one chip testing station" and "at least on display device." Thus, this claim is not obvious over Gelinotte in view of French, and as such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants further note that all of these rejected claims except for independent claim 46 are claims depending from claims 33 and 51. Thus, if independent claims 33 and 51 are allowable, their dependent claims 36, 37, 41, 42, 45, 47-50, 54, 55 and 57-59 also should be allowable.

Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to call the Examiner's attention to the lack of inclusion of in the Office Action of an initialed copy of the substitute Form 1449 from the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 24, 2008. Applicants respectfully request that an initialed copy be included with the next Office Communication.

Please credit any overpayment and charge any deficiency in filed fees to H&A Deposit Account No. 50-2929, making reference to Attorney Docket No. P50297.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pat BUTRICO *et al.*



Abraham HersHKovitz  
Reg. No. 45,294

Dinh X. Nguyen  
Reg. No. 54,923

Brian Hearn  
Reg. No. 62,370

Date: January 26, 2009

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES  
2845 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone 703-370-4800  
Facsimile 703-370-4809  
Email [patent@hershkovitz.net](mailto:patent@hershkovitz.net)

P50297.A12-Amdt; AH/pjj